



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/774,954

02/09/2004

W. Paul Willes

23839-11592

8643

758

7590

07/25/2008

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

HERNANDEZ, NELSON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/774,954

Applicant(s)

WILLES ET AL.

Examiner

Nelson D. Hernández

Art Unit

2622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-22, 24 and 26-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-22, 24 and 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on April 24, 2008.

Claims 1, 15, 26 have been amended. **Claim 29** has been newly added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1 and 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claim 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 in view of Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 and further in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2.**

Regarding claim 1, Campbell et al. discloses a video camera (See camera 2 as shown in figs. 2, 5 and 6) adapted for flush mounting comprising: a lens (45 as shown in figs. 6 and 7); a low profile camera housing comprising a

shell (the Examiner is reading the bracket 1 as shown in fig. 3 (11 in fig. 4) as the shell as claimed), an end of the shell circumscribing an opening (opening 12 as shown in figs. 3 and 6; opening 22 as shown in fig. 4) for receiving the lens, the end of the shell adapted for flush mounting in direct contact with a transparent medium (Note bracket 1 in figs. 2 and 6 flush mounted in direct contact to the windshield 31), the lens substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening (Note in fig. 7 that the lens 45 is substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening); an video sensor assembly (44 as shown in figs. 5 and 7) within the low profile housing (Co. 4, lines 51-59), wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the lens are used to detect markers on the roadway to warn a driver when the vehicle is outside the driving lane (Col. 1, lines 32-58; col. 4, lines 52-59) (See also col. 3, lines 3-67; col. 4, line 31 – col. 5, line 39).

Although Campbell et al. discloses using an adhesive (Fig. 1: 41; col. 3, lines 42-67; col. 4, lines 8-30) adapted for flush mounting the end of the shell circumscribing the opening in direct contact with the transparent medium (See figs. 2 and 6), Campbell et al. does not explicitly disclose a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing to perform said flush mounting the end of the shell circumscribing the opening in direct contact with the transparent medium; that the video camera is a network video camera having an adjustable video sensor assembly that transmits the received images through a network interface.

However, Kendrick discloses a video camera mounting system (See fig. 10) comprising: a low profile camera (Fig. 10: 15) housing defining an opening (opening having lens 11 as shown in fig. 10) and comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly (Fig. 10: 10; col. 5, lines 2-15; the video sensor is electronically adjusted using interface 18 as shown in fig. 9), wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the opening and transmits the received images through an interface (the video sensor is connected to a video monitor 20 through a cable 19 as shown in figs. 10 and 11); and a mounting assembly (suction cups 16 and 17 as shown in fig. 10) attached to the low profile camera housing and adapted for flush mounting the opening with a transparent medium (glass 7 of side rear turn signal and stop lamp assembly 6 as shown in fig. 4) (Col. 5, lines 2-25).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concepts of using a mounting assembly attached to the low profile camera housing to flush mount the lens of camera with the transparent medium and also to use of a video camera that can pan and tilt over a one time use camera as taught in Kendrick to modify the teaching in Campbell et al. to have a mounting assembly attached to said low profile camera housing to perform said flush mounting the end of said shell circumscribing said opening in direct contact with said transparent medium and to use video camera comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly, wherein the video sensor assembly receives images through said opening and adapted to transmit the received images through an

interface. The motivation to do so would have been to allow the camera to be removably mounted to the transparent surface, thus avoiding the use of adhesives and to improve the operation of the camera by allowing the user to record video of a specific scene while controlling the line of sight of said video camera while receiving a life feedback.

The combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick fails to teach that the video camera is a network video camera and transmits the received images through a network interface.

However, Tashiro et al. discloses a network video camera (Fig. 1) comprising: a low profile camera housing (See fig. 1) defining an opening (Fig. 1: 6) and comprising an adjustable video sensor assembly (Fig. 4: 9), wherein said video sensor assembly receives images through the opening and transmits the received images through a network interface so that a user can control the camera remotely using a web browser on the internet (Fig. 9: 46) (Col. 1, lines 8-43; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 9, lines 34-67).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Campbell et al. and Kendrick by using a network video camera adapted to transmit the received images through a network interface. The motivation to do so would have been to control the camera using a browser and receive the video image on a remote location as suggested by Tashiro et al. (Col. 9, lines 47-67).

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that said mounting assembly is connected to a mounting point located on the low profile housing (See Kendrick, fig. 10, suction cups are located on the low profile housing).

Regarding claim 3, claim 3 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "a connector selected from the group consisting of threads, screws, snaps, rivets, plugs, Velcro, connectors, spring material, compression material, and pins", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Although the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 does not go into the details of how the mounting point is connected to the mounting assembly, Official Notice is taken that that the use of different materials such as screws, pins, threads or even glue can be used to attach suction cups to different devices so they can hold the device in place, and one of an ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need of a connection means to hold the suction cups and the camera mount together in order to hold said mount in place and would recognize the different types of connection means available at the time to perform said connection.

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "mounting point is selected from the group consisting of a front mounting point, a side mounting point, a top mounting point, a bottom mounting point, bottom rear mounting point, a rear mounting point and a clip-on attachment point", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches the mounting point being a front mounting point (See Kendrick , fig. 10).

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "mounting assembly is selected from the group consisting of a suction cup mounting assembly a multi-purpose suction cup mounting assembly, a multi-purpose flat mounting assembly, a clip-on suction cup mounting assembly and a bracket mounting assembly", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches the mounting point being a front mounting point (Kendrick discloses the use of suction cups). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 6, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 8, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "network is a network selected from the group consisting of a power line network, a wireless network, an acoustic network, a wired network, the Internet, a Local Area Network, a Wide Area Network, and an optic network", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayer, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the network can be the Internet (Tashiro et al., col. 9, lines 47-67).

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "image sensor is powered from a power source selected from the group consisting of solar power, battery power, AC power, and DC power",

meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the image sensor is powered with the power of the vehicle (this teaches the use of DC power).

Regarding claim 14, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 16, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "network interface is connected to a device selected from the group consisting of a bridge, a hub, a switch, a router, a gateway, and a power adapter", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Although the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 fails to

Art Unit: 2622

disclose what type of network interface is used to communicate the images to a remote user, Official Notice is taken that the use of bridges, hubs, switches, routers, gateways and power adapters are notoriously well known in the art as network interfaces used to transmit image data to a remote user through a network. Since Tashiro et al. discloses the use of internet and servers to communicate the image data to a remote user, one of an ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need of a network interface to transmit said image data to a remote user on a network and would find obvious to select from the available types of networks interface in order to perform a proper communication between different devices in a network.

Regarding claim 20, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claim 18.

Regarding claim 22, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the low profile camera housing further comprises a storage device (Tashiro et al., fig. 9: 44) for storing images received by the video sensor assembly (Tashiro et al., col. 9, lines 46-56).

Regarding claim 24, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 26, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. teaches the same as discussed and analyzed in claim 1.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Novak, US 2002/0141657 A1.

Regarding claim 7, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the video sensor assembly is electronically remotely adjustable via sensor resolution and wide-angle optics.

However, Novak teaches a system for controlling a web-cam transmission wherein a web-cam capable of capturing images of a wide field (i.e. using wide angle lens) stores the images in a memory and said images are processes so that a remote user can control the field of view by performing simulated pan and tilt functions wherein the user is observing a portion of the image and if wants to see a different portion of the image, the processor send a different portion of the image (This also teaches adjusting the field of view using sensor resolution since only a portion of the whole resolution of the sensor is transmitted) so that there is not need to have pan and tilt motors controlling a camera movement (Page 1, ¶ 0006 and 0023; page 2, ¶ 0024; page 3, ¶ 0036 and 0043).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Novak as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Campbell et al., Kendrick, and Tashiro et al. by having the video sensor assembly is electronically remotely adjustable via sensor resolution and wide

angle optics. The motivation to do so would have been to avoid the use of motors to control the pan and tilt function as suggested by Novak (Page 2, ¶0024).

6. Claims 10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Schnell, US Patent 6,768,868 B1.

Regarding claim 10, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the housing is weatherproof.

However, the use of waterproof housings for cameras is notoriously well known in the art as taught by Schnell. Schnell teaches a housing (Fig. 7: 702) for a camera (See fig. 7, said housing being waterproof so that the camera can be outdoors while being protected from the weather changes (Col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 10; see also col. 2, lines 50-65).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Schnell as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing in Campbell et al., Kendrick and Tashiro et al. by having a housing being weatherproof. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the housing so it can protect the camera and inside camera components

form the weather and temperature changes as suggested by Schnell (Col. 2, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 12, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Schnell as discussed and analyzed in claim 10 teaches that a back cover is connected to the rear of said housing (See Schnell, back cover 703b in fig. 7).

Regarding claim 13, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Schnell as discussed and analyzed in claim 10 teaches that the back cover contains a mounting point that connects the mounting assembly (in Schnell, back cover 103b is mounted to the camera so the camera can be flush mounted to a tree, post, or other mounting surface; col. 3, lines 33-43).

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of MacKay, US Patent 5,208,624.

Regarding claim 15, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach a glare shield covering the opening.

However, MacKay discloses a camera (Fig. 2), comprising a housing (10), said housing circumscribing an opening (See fig. 2) for receiving a lens (34 and 36 as shown in fig. 3); MacKay further discloses the use of a polarized filter (Fig.

2: 28) on front of the camera opening for receiving the lens (See fig. 2) to reduce the glare produced by the sun and light coming into the camera (Col. 3, lines 3-26; col. 4, line 8 - col. 5, line 42; col. 6, line 52 - col. 7, line 4).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of MacKay as a whole, it would have been obvious to apply the concept of using a polarized filter in front of the camera opening to protect the image sensitive device from glare produced from the sun or other lights coming into the camera as taught in MacKay to modify the teaching of Campbell et al., Kendrick and Tashiro et al. to have a glare shield covering the opening. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the glare produced by the sun and light coming into the camera.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2.

Regarding claim 19, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that said network interface is connected to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another protocol.

However, Ward teaches a camera comprising a network interface (Fig. 1: 32) to transmit the captured image data through a network allowing a user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the

Art Unit: 2622

World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data; Ward also discloses that the interface may connect to a variety of known networks, such as a public switched telephone network (PSTN), ISDN, an RF cellular phone network, or Ethernet (col. 2, lines 39-59)), (This teaches connecting to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another, since the image data may be transferred to a telephone or a web page, the protocol between devices changes) (Col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 3, line 16 – col. 4, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Ward as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the interface in Campbell et al., Kendrick and Tashiro et al. by having said network interface connected to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another protocol. The motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data.

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Strandwitz, US 2003/0112335 A1.

Regarding claim 21, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the network interface further comprises a bandwidth allocation system.

However, Strandwitz teaches a wireless camera (See fig. 2) that transmit images through a network, wherein said camera comprises a bandwidth allocation system (See fig. 2: 190) used to find a proportion of available bandwidth in a connection serving a plurality of camera so as to define percentage of allocation of bandwidth for a given camera or from one camera to another (Page 2, ¶0028, page 3, ¶ 0035; page 5, ¶ 0063).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Strandwitz as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Campbell et al., Kendrick and Tashiro et al. by having a bandwidth allocation system to communicate in a network. The motivation to do so would have been to properly define a portion of the bandwidth to interact to transmit the images or interact with multiple terminals in the network and to receive a proper amount of bandwidth as required by the camera when transmitting image data.

10. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 in view of Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 and further in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of McBride, 6,812,970 B1.

Regarding claim 27, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach that the network interface is adapted to transmit the received images over a power line network.

However, McBride teaches the concept of having a surveillance camera (See figs. 1 and 6) system wherein the camera have a communication interface (See fig. 6) to transmits the image data taken over a power line to a monitor receiver or to a network (See col. 3, line 53 – col. 4, line 12; col. 4, line 50 – col. 5, line 8; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 63).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of McBride as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the network interface of the network video camera to transmits the image data taken over a power line. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the operation of the network camera by eliminating the need of running cables thus making easy to install the camera without requiring a professional installer as suggested by McBride (Col. 2, lines 17-34).

Regarding claim 28, limitations can be found in claim 27.

11. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al., US Patent 6,170,955 B1 and Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1 in view of Tashiro et al., US Patent 6,705,774 B2 and further in view of Toyoda, US Patent 6,137,958.

Regarding claim 29, the combined teaching of Campbell et al. in view of Kendrick and further in view of Tashiro et al. fails to teach a glare shield between the lens and the adjustable video sensor, the glare shield substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening.

However, Toyoda discloses a camera (See figs. 1 and 2), comprising a housing having an opening for receiving a lens (Fig. 1: 2); the camera further comprising a photosensitive device (Fig. 1: 30, although Toyoda discloses a film as the image sensitive device, Toyoda further discloses that the invention can be applied to a digital camera without departing from the scope of the invention; Col. 28, lines 58-62); and a polarized filter (3 as shown in figs. 1 and 3) located between the lens and the image sensitive device to cut-off light reflected from an object field resulting from flash emissions (Col. 14, lines 47-57). Also as shown in fig. 1, Toyoda further discloses that the polarized filter is located substantially in level with the end of the camera housing having the opening for receiving the lens (Note that the polarized filter is located at the front end portion of the camera in a close position to the lens) (Col. 5, line 44 - col. 6, line 8; col. 6, lines 21-30; col. 6, line 45 – col. 7, line 48; col. 14, lines 47-57).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Campbell et al. and Kendrick in view of Tashiro et al. and further in view of Toyoda as a whole, it would have

been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept of having a glare shield located between the lens and the sensor of a camera to cut-off light reflected from an object field resulting from flash emissions as taught by Toyoda to modify the teaching of Campbell et al., Kendrick and Tashiro et al. to have a glare shield between the lens and the adjustable video sensor, the glare shield substantially in level with the end of the shell circumscribing the opening. The motivation to do so would have been to cut-off light reflected from an object field resulting from flash emissions as suggested by Toyoda (Col. 14, lines 47-57).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. **Marks Jr. (US Patent 4,863,130)** discloses an adjustable device (See fig. 1) for mounting an electronic imaging camera (Fig. 1: 12), said adjustable device being adapted to flush mount the front portion of the camera (see fig. 2, the camera lens (13) is flush mounted to the surface of the window (23)); the adjustable device further comprising a mounting bolt (Fig. 1: 9) for holding the camera to the adjustable device; a plurality of suction cups (Fig. 1: 1) to secure the adjustable device in position when flush mounting the front camera portion to the surface of the window (Col. 3, line 27 – col. 4, line 8).

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernández whose telephone number is (571)272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernández
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
July 23, 2008

/Lin Ye/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622